

REMARKS

In the Office action, claims 8, 10, 14-16, 18-21, 23-28, 30, 32-34, 36 and 37 were rejected as anticipated by Jahn; claims 8-11 and 14-37 were rejected as anticipated by Madden; claims 8-11 and 14-37 were rejected as anticipated by Friel; and claims 9, 11, 22, 29 and 35 were rejected as being unpatentable over Jahn in view of Corrigan.

The claims have been amended to remove indefiniteness in that some of the claims in the preamble recited a material application system but in the body of the claim referred to a spraying system. The term material application system is adopted in the claims as the invention may be used with any type of material application system whether spray, dispensing or so on. Claim 8 has been amended to recite that the operating data is real time data. Claims 19, 28 and 32 have been amended to recite that the operating data includes flow rate. As an initial comment, Applicants do not acquiesce in the question of whether Friel or Madden are prior art under 102(e), however, since neither reference either alone or in combination renders the claims unpatentable there is no need to consider whether the references are or are not prior art. Applicants reserve the right to challenge whether either reference is prior art under 102(e) at such time as such question may be presented.

The art of record makes no suggestion of monitoring a material application system with real time operating data from a remote location. The present claims are drawn to a material application system and monitoring such system for real time operating data from a remote location. The art of record quite simply does not address this aspect of the invention. Jahn is concerned with paint manufacturing, not the application system of the paint to an object. There is no real time monitoring of an application system. To the contrary, Jahn is very clear at col. 6,

lines 37-59 that the data being collected is for a panel that has already had paint applied thereto. Moreover, at col. 6 lines 60 *et seq.* the text referred to in the Office action refers to a simulation program. Nothing in Jahn suggests real time monitoring of a material application system. Similarly, it is respectfully submitted that neither Madden nor Friel relate to monitoring in real time a material application system. Madden relates to an assembly line but there is no apparent reference to monitoring in real time the operating parameters of a material application system. Although Friel relates to paint, Friel is concerned with making paint, not its application. It is believed that there is no suggestion in Friel, Madden or Jahn to monitor in real time the operating data of a material application system. Applicants believe that they are the first to conceive the idea of remotely monitoring a material application system while it is in use as set forth in the claims. It is noteworthy that despite the existence of many patents having to do with remote monitoring and distributed networks such as the Internet, not one refers to the concept of real time monitoring of a material application system from a remote location. The art of record simply does not anticipate nor make any suggestion that would render this concept unpatentable as set forth in the claims.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the various dependent claims as such claims do recite additional patentable subject matter, however, detailed comment will be deferred pending further examination of the independent claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 26, 2004

By: Leonard L. Lewis
Leonard L. Lewis, Reg. No. 31,176
Phone: (216) 622-8200